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Abstract

Implementation of the State Program for the Development and Functioning of Languages 2011-2019 was a primary agenda of the language policy and planning of multilingual Kazakhstan for the last nine years. In order to evaluate the efficacy of the State Program, the present study examined to what extent the stated goals of the official language policy intersect and overlap with the actual language practices and attitudes of young Kazakhstani students who attend universities of Almaty and Astana. The necessity of the evaluation is conditioned by a lack of previous research on this topic. Data was collected by means of online survey. Overall, nexus analysis of the data identified discrepancies between the planned and actual Kazakh, Russian and English use in various private and public domains, language proficiencies and prestige, language attitudes towards corpus and acquisition planning activities. The current study points to the importance of monitoring the language policy performance in Kazakhstan for correcting and adjusting the future policies.
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1. Introduction

For more than two decades, the planning of the language policy in Kazakhstan has been determined by a series of the State Programs for the Development and Functioning of Languages. The third State Program was implemented over the past nine years, from 2011 to 2019. The deadline for its implementation ended, and the fourth State Program for the years 2020-2025 has recently came into force. No previous studies, however, have been published that analysed the accomplished progress of the State Program for the Development and Functioning of Languages 2011-2019 (further referred to as the State Program) in the stated language policy realisation.

The present study focuses on investigating the effects of the language policy and planning (further referred to as LPP) on everyday Kazakh, Russian and English language use and attitudes in order to find out whether there is a gap between the stated LPP objectives and the actual language practices of the youth studying in Astana and Almaty. That is, the research seeks to explore to what extent the actual language use practices and attitudes towards Kazakh, Russian and English converge with and reflect the official LPP in Kazakhstan. In order to shed more light on the relationship between LPP, language use and language attitudes, the study aims to provide answers to the following research questions:

i. Which proficiencies of young Kazakhstanis in the Kazakh, Russian and English languages correspond to the level required by the State Program? To what extent are these languages employed in public and private domains?

ii. What kind of attitudes do young Kazakhstanis have towards activities related to acquisition and corpus planning? To what extent students’ vision of Kazakh, Russian and English reflect the perceptions and language prestige rate instilled by the LPP?

iii. How effective is the declared language policy in terms of promotion of societal and educational trilingualism among Kazakhstani students in Astana and Almaty?

The study employs the data drawn from the online questionnaire, which was developed, among other goals, to assess the implementation of the aims set by the official LPP. The completion stage of the State Program is perfect timing to carry out an initial evaluation of whether its assigned objectives have been successfully completed as well as to
determine which tasks performance was not particularly effective. Monitoring and analysis of the stated LPP implementation is of great practical relevance to the management of the future policies (Gorter and Cenoz 2017: 244).

I will start the research paper with specifying the factors that led to the establishment of trilingualism policy and continue with describing the current linguistic situation in the country in terms of Kazakh, Russian and English levels of proficiency, prestige and frequency of use. In Chapter 2.2, I will present a brief overview of the most pressing LPP issues in the republic and their solutions suggested by the aims and goals of the State Program. After discussing the methodological core of the study, I move on to examining relations of the state language policies and individual experiences with the Kazakh, Russian and English language use and attitudes. The Conclusion gives a brief summary of the research results and closes with providing the recommendations for Kazakhstani language policymakers.
2. Setting the scene: language policy and planning in Kazakhstan

2.1 Multilingualism in Kazakhstan

The stage of gaining independence in Kazakhstan is characterised by the quite peculiar demographic and linguistic situation that was historically predetermined. The young republic inherited from the Soviet past a demographic shift and a low status of the Kazakh language among the country’s residents. Decline in the population of the ethnic Kazakhs can be explained by mass starvation in the 1930s, military casualties during the World War II and repressions in the 1930s-1950s (Kozybaeva 2017; Zharkenova 2017; Zimovina 2017). This, in combination with migratory inflow from other republics of the USSR and influx of Russians (Alekseenko and Aubakirova 2017; Kuznetsova 2019: 52; Zhetpysbayev 2019: 95), was the reason of the major demographic transformations of the population in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. According to the 1989 Soviet census, the population of the KSSR consisted of 39.7% of Kazakhs, 37.8% of Russians and 22.5% of other ethnic groups (Germans, Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Tatars, Uyghurs, Belarusians, etc.). Due to the Russian language superiority, this hodgepodge of different ethnicities used Russian as the lingua franca in all public spheres (Grenoble 2003: 1), and the Kazakh language was moved to the background of the linguistic repertoire used in the KSSR (Dave 2007: 2; Kulzhanova 2012; Smagulova 2008: 9).

After the Soviet Union collapse in 1991, the Republic of Kazakhstan charted its own course for language policy and planning, and both Kazakh and Russian were proclaimed official languages of the country. In July 1997, the Law “On Languages” was adopted. Article 4 enshrines Kazakh as the state language, and Article 5 states that the Russian language shall be used officially in governmental organisations and local government on a level with the Kazakh language. It is noteworthy that Kazakhstan was one of the few post-Soviet countries, alongside with Belarus and Kyrgyzstan, that adopted the legal framework targeting not only the titular language development but also preservation of the Russian language (Pavlenko 2013: 267). In addition, bearing in mind multinational composition of the new republic, the Law “On Languages” (1997) took responsibility for protection and development of all languages of the Kazakhstani peoples.
In the late 2000s, the government adopted a decision to make a transition from societal bilingualism to trilingualism: the expanded language policy formula of the country now comprises not only Kazakh and Russian but also English. The idea of focusing on the trilingualism was first announced in 2007, in the Address to the People of Kazakhstan by the former head of the state Nazarbayev. In the speech, the first President clearly outlined the positions of the Kazakh, Russian and English languages and emphasised their significance for the community:

“Kazakhstan should be perceived in the world as a highly educated country, the population of which uses three languages: Kazakh as the state language, Russian as the language of interethnic communication and English as the language of successful integration into the global economy.” (Nazarbayev 2007).

As evident from the statement, the status of Kazakh has official primacy over other languages. The role of the mediator in communication between different ethnicities is assigned to the Russian language, and English has to assist the country in achieving sufficient competitiveness in order to fit in the international economy. All three languages in aggregate are necessary for the representation of Kazakhstani as the intelligent nation. In the same year of 2007, Nazarbayev signed the Presidential Decree on the implementation of the cultural project Tripartite Unity of Languages, and the quotation above became the mantra of Kazakhstan’s language policymaking.

Three languages have entered and currently have been firmly rooted in the country’s educational standards. Kazakh and Russian became compulsory subjects already in 2007 (Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On Education” 2007). Learning English from the first grade in schools and its mandatory acquisition at all levels of education have been launched since 2013 (Meirbekova et al. 2018: 17). Apart from learning Kazakh and Russian at the level that meets the requirements of the State Compulsory Standard of Education (2012), all students can choose whether they prefer Kazakh or Russian as a medium of instruction as teaching in schools and at universities is conducted in both languages. With an intent to transform the existing educational system and to enhance English competence among high school students, the government introduced teaching of natural science subjects, i.e. computer science, physics, chemistry and biology, in English in a pilot mode (“On approval of the State Program for the Development of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2016 - 2019” 2016).
Despite the commitment of the government to ensure that the nation speaks three languages, competence of Kazakhstanis in Kazakh, Russian and English is different. Today, as in the past, the level of the Russian language knowledge remains high, compared with Kazakh. In 1996, only around half of the country’s population spoke the Kazakh language fluently, and the number of Russian language speakers was almost two times higher (Arenov and Kalmykov 1997: 21-22). The most recent national census results in 2009 revealed that 94.4% of the population understood spoken language in Russian (Kazakhstan Census 2011: 24). Proficiency in the state language was on a somewhat lower level and yet demonstrated the positive dynamics: 74% of the total population of Kazakhstan were fluent in Kazakh (Kazakhstan Census 2011: 23). As for English competency, 15.4% of the country’s citizenry understood speech in English (Kazakhstan Census 2011: 24). The most recent competency data was publicly announced by the Minister of Culture and Sports Mukhamediuly at the government meeting in March 2018. According to his words, the share of the population who speaks the state language was 83.1%, and 22.3% of Kazakhstan citizens spoke all three languages (Zakon 2018). Unfortunately, the Minister did not indicate the source where the statistics came from and how it was obtained.

The frequency of the Kazakh, Russian and English language use in the everyday lives of Kazakhstanis varies. Kazakh and Russian compete among themselves for the presence across numerous public and private domains of language use (Protassova and Alisharieva 2016), and for now Russian seems to be winning this competition. This is evidenced in the studies of Mazhitayeva et al. (2016), Smagulova (2016), Zhumanova et al. (2016) and Kuzhabekova (2019) that declare the Russian language as the most frequent means of everyday communication and point at the issue of the Kazakh language adoption into all spheres of public life. Kuzhabekova (2019: 1) concludes that “the continuing dominance of Russian may create challenges for maintenance of Kazakh during introduction of trilingual education policy”. Suleimenova and Tursun (2016: 153) and Nowicka (2019: 6) argue that the ethnic Kazakhs have low proficiency in Kazakh, and they simultaneously are forced to and prefer to use Russian in daily conversations. As Kazakh and Russian are the languages necessary for survival in the country, “in everyday life, unless they need English for a job or travelling, people in Kazakhstan are not exposed to the language much” (Arapova 2017: 8).
While Russian and English languages are enjoying stable eminence among Kazakhstanis, the Kazakh language is still undergoing a radical shift in terms of its position in the society. Mazhitayeva et al. (2016) note that English is recognised as the most prestigious among three languages, and the young generation perceives it as the language that provides a large number of educational, travel, work and social development opportunities. Zhumanova et al. (2016: 4242) state that English becomes more prestigious than the Kazakh language. In the Soviet period, the Russian-speaking population attained the most privileged position among other language speakers (Smagulova 2016). As Kulzhanova (2012: 8) rightly points out, “Russian became the “high culture”, the urban, the modern, the one everyone aspired to be part of, while Kazakh became the kitchen language, preserved in rural areas”. Over time, however, the government took steps towards restoring the prestige of Kazakh. Now the language is continuing to gain a natural acceptance (Zhumanova et al. 2016), and the current trends demonstrate the increasing popularity of Kazakh among the young people (Akanova 2017).

Complicated historical background of Kazakhstan led to the propensity of its citizens to the Kazakh-Russian societal multilingualism, and the authorities made a decision to use this situation as the basis of the language policy in the newly born country. Globalisation and emerging importance of English in the world resulted in this language being maintained and developed in Kazakhstan. Due to the trilingualism policy, every citizen is currently expected to master Kazakh, Russian and English, although these languages competences, prestige and frequency of use are uneven among the population.

2.2 The State Program: resolving challenges faced by the current language policy

2.2.1 Primary directions of the language policy and the required levels of languages competence

The State Program declared as its purpose granting “the language policy that ensures the full-scale functioning of the state language as the most important factor in strengthening the Kazakhstani identity and unity while maintaining the languages of all the ethnic groups living in Kazakhstan” (2012: 2). The document stipulated a set of directions for the LPP development: (1) finding effective ways to ensure mastery of the state
language, (2) expansion of the scope of the state language use, (3) raising the level of linguistic culture of Kazakhstanis as an element of the socio-cultural wealth of the intellectual nation, and (4) a creation of favorable conditions for the development of linguistic capital. By the “linguistic culture” policymakers imply an ability to utilise language norms of spoken and written communication, and they relate this concept to the terminology, anthroponymy and onomastics issues. Furthermore, “linguistic capital” refers here to the linguistic repertoire that encompasses obligatory mastery over the Kazakh, Russian and English languages. Each of the four directions of the State Program had its ultimate goals and the so-called target and performance indicators that served as benchmarks for assessing the progress in these goals implementation.

As competence in the three languages, their prestige and frequency of use in Kazakhstan were already discussed in the previous Chapter, I take an overview of the goals for regulating these LPP components as the starting point. Table 1 presents the milestones established by the State Program for the Kazakh, Russian and English languages acquisition plan.

Table 1. The State Program target indicators for proficiency in languages (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of the population speaking the state language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of the school graduates with B1 level of Kazakh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of the population speaking Russian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of the population speaking English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of the population speaking Kazakh, Russian and English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20,5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The given indicators are integral for interpreting prioritisation of the government in terms of language performance. In the 2012 Address to the people, Nazarbayev encouraged equally caring attitudes towards preservation of both Kazakh and Russian
language skills (Nazarbayev 2012). At the same time, concurrently with the advancement of Kazakh language, the State Program intended to only maintain the knowledge of Russian, although at a fairly high level. As can be seen from the table, proficiency in Kazakh should not be lower than in Russian, even if the difference is only one percent. Trilingualism and the knowledge of English were also proposed as requirements for the republic’s citizens, albeit less demanding in percentage terms. It is worth noting the inaccuracy in the formulation of these indicators: a specific level of proficiency (B1) was attributed only to school students speaking Kazakh, and in other cases, “speaking” may be perceived differently. This issue was criticised in the article “The optimistic minister: How many citizens of the country actually speak the Kazakh language?” (Isabaeva 2018). The journalist observes that the Minister of Culture and Sports Mukhamediuly, who publicly reported about 83.1% of the population being able to speak Kazakh, did not specify the details of the language situation analysis. Isabaeva, therefore, makes an assumption that those who knew at least a few words in Kazakh were also included in the category of Kazakh speakers. Similarly, the State Program did not give any explanation on what is implied by “speaking” a language. It is also unclear why the percentages of language proficiency were not indicated for each year and how exactly it was calculated, for instance, why the share of the population speaking Kazakh was planned to increase for 2% in 2017-2018 but for 5% in 2018-2019.

2.2.2 The State Program and promotion of linguistic prestige
One of the focuses of the State Program was on increasing the prestige of Kazakh by means of forming public opinion regarding the state language promotion. First of all, the policymakers sought to create and consolidate the prestigious image of the state language speakers in the public consciousness. Secondly, detailed studies had to be conducted for preventive identification of negative stereotypes regarding the use of the state language. The State Program did not specify what kind of stereotypes were meant. Thirdly, an important aspect was the promotion of Kazakh as the language of family communication. Additionally, the State Program echoed the Constitution (1995), enshrining mastery of the language as the duty of every citizen of Kazakhstan. The former President of the country was also quoted in the LPP document as expressing aspiration about the state language becoming “the main factor of uniting of all
Kazakhstaniis” (2012: 4). The indicator for the goal of the Kazakh language promotion was to allocate 10% of the total amount of the government social procurement funds for popularizing the state language. This indicator rather produces an assessment of the efforts made but is not suitable for checking the goal fulfillment per se.

Against this background of the state language active support, it is important to distinguish what kind of perceptions of Russian and English languages were instilled in Kazakhstaniis by the State Program. For the Russian language in this regard, the key words from the LPP document were “presence” and “support”, originating from ensuring the presence of the language in the communicative-linguistic space of Kazakhstan and the support of its functioning in the country’s information field (2012: 19). The formulation itself, however, implies maintenance - not development - of Russian as the language of communication and obtaining information. In the State Program, the English language was characterised as a means of business and international communication (2012: 21). The image of the trilingualism was constructed as a “competitive advantage of Kazakhstaniis” (2012: 7), thus presenting this feature of the LPP as the multilingual calling card of Kazakhstani citizens in the future.

2.2.3 Dissemination of the Kazakh language across the social sphere

Along with other goals, the State Program planned to spread the state language use in all spheres of life in the Kazakhstani society: in various interactional contexts throughout daily life, in the fields of international communication, tourism, leisure and entertainment, law, science and new technologies. The LPP document mainly focused attention on dissemination of the Kazakh language in three areas, starting with the home domain. Aminov et al. (2010: 2) and Amantay et al. (2017: 19) observe that Russian is more frequently chosen as the dominant home language instead of Kazakh. Smagulova (2016: 104) recognises the expanding use of Kazakh not in the urban home but in schools, which leads to better reading and writing skills and constrains development in speaking and understanding oral speech.

The sphere of culture, including literature, is the key area of the Kazakh language distribution (Kuchaeva et al. 2017: 92). At the moment, however, the situation with literary translations in the state language is rather complex. Shortage of literary fiction novels in Kazakh is practically not highlighted in scientific papers; only
journalists and bloggers address this issue in their online publications. Blogger Yerzhan Rashev, for example, posted on his channel on Telegram an observation about the lack of Kazakh translations of Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey, following the conclusion that “the population does not have access to the fundamental texts of the world civilisation” (Rashev 2019). Unfortunately, like Homer’s works, most of the world masterpieces are still not translated, and a range of fiction books in the Kazakh language is extremely limited (Kiseleva 2019). Similarly, as Zhaksylykov (2017) points out, Kazakhstan experiences trouble producing a sufficient amount of translations for the latest scientific and other specialised literature in the areas of science, culture, education and domestic and foreign policy, including encyclopedias, dictionaries and reference books of foreign origin. Tanzharyk (2017) also emphasises this issue and criticises the very poor quality of those few scientific works that have been translated. Young people, therefore, prefer to turn to more comprehensive and high-quality sources, and the value of the Kazakh language in science rapidly decreases. Despite the importance of producing literary translations in Kazakh, as well as of the state language dissemination in the family domain, no target indicators were provided by the State Program for monitoring these tasks performance.

Throughout the decade, there has been a growing scholars’ awareness of the issues that pertain to the Kazakh language distribution in mass media. Before adopting the Law “On TV and radio broadcasting” (2012), the number of media in the state language was critically low: in 2010, only 2.3% of all central and local television and radio channels functioned in Kazakh, while there were 15.6% of newspapers and magazines in Kazakh, compared with 79.4% published in Russian (Aminov et al. 2010: 23-24). Since 2012, the Law has established the balance between the volume of television and radio programs in different languages: the amount of media content in Kazakh should not be less than the total volume of broadcasting in other languages. Aksholakova and Ismailova (2013: 1583) and Vyalikh (2011: 161) note the absence of the quality Kazakh language content in the Internet. Vyalikh, for instance, emphasises the lack of competitiveness as an intrinsic attribute of the Kazakh language in mass media ensuing from unoriginality of translations (2011: 161). Muravyova also identifies the “reduction of the significant gap between the quantity and the quality of Russian and Kazakh language media” as a paramount task for the Internet space of Kazakhstan.

Within the confines of the issues surrounding Kazakh media, the State Program prescribed enhancing the growth of the amount of the Kazakh language content in state-owned mass media (72% by 2019). Performance indicators for work in a given area were as follows: the number of new television projects in the state language that are broadcast in state media should grow annually by 10%; the share of the state information order focused on supporting print media outlets in the state language should be equal 50% annually. These tasks, however, did not provide for quality control of Kazakh language content, which is a significant oversight in connection with the non-competitiveness of the Kazakh language media in comparison with Russian language sources.

2.2.4 Perspectives of the State Program on resolving corpus planning issues
The first issue of corpus planning concerns the implementation of the Latin script in the Kazakh language. Since the 40s of the twentieth century, the Cyrillic script had been employed in the Kazakh writing system, and in 2017, the former President of the republic signed a decree on the transition of the Kazakh alphabet from the Cyrillic to the Latin script. Before 2017, there were two early versions of the new script that gave rise to lively discussions among linguists and policymakers. These two drafts contained shortcomings that were addressed in designing the final version, however, letters in the currently adopted script do not follow one-to-one correspondence, and several Russian phonemes are still present there (Kim 2018: 17). Driven by a desire to resolve all imperfections, researchers show an increased interest in this issue (Molgazhdarov and Baimukanova 2018; Zhusupov et al. 2018; Kambar 2019), and the final point in the debate on this subject has not yet been set.

Scholars note such positive aspects of the transition to the Latin script as ensuring more effective integration into the world scientific, educational and technological processes; providing more convenient work in information networks; facilitating the learning of foreign languages by Kazakhstans and of the Kazakh language by foreigners; formation and strengthening of the national identity of the
Kazakhstani people (Nurligenova and Lim 2019: 57; Batyrbekkyzy et al. 2018: 131; Nazarova 2019: 14). Despite the state’s promises about the near future full of opportunities, the mood of the population is not conducive for the implementation of this reform. In 2017, Bureau of Express Monitoring of the Public Opinion “DEMOSCOPE” conducted a survey among more than 1800 residents of Kazakhstan (Jalilova 2017), and according to the results, 60% of respondents belonging to the youth aged 18 to 29 did not consider it necessary to switch to Latin. A similar study conducted on a smaller scale among Kazakhstani citizens illustrated that 135 of 220 of respondents (61.4%) were against the switching (Kobzeva and Trubachev 2019: 391). As the main reasons for the negative attitude towards the transition respondents indicated incomprehensibility of the new script and top-down type of the reform since “there was no large demand in our society for that” (Kobzeva and Trubachev 2019: 391).

Transition from Cyrillic- to Latin-based writing system for the Kazakh language was set for the last stage of the State Program, 2017-2019, as the reform was officially announced in 2017. Naturally, the primary task for these three years was to apply the new script in all areas of public relations. At the same time, no indicators were given to track the progress of the transition.

The second problematic aspect of corpus planning is the regulation of geographical objects renaming practices. Over the years of independence, such practices took place throughout the republic. According to the State Program 2020-2025 (2019: 9), names of about 20 districts, cities, regions, 1500 settlements, 1400 educational, cultural, sports objects, 85 railway stations and 25000 onomastic names (streets, avenues, microdistricts, etc.) have been changed. The reasons for large numbers of renamings have ideological character: the goal of the state was to distance the country from communist ideology and references to Marxism-Leninism reflected in the names of toponymic objects as well as to inject Kazakhization into the urban spaces (Kaşikçi 2019). Kazakhization will be defined here as the Kazakhstani nation’s identity-building policies and can be understood as “the revival, the strengthening, development, representation and domination of basic socio-cultural, ethno-demographic, political, and legal values as well as resources of the Kazakhs” (Karin and Chebotarev 2002: 1). Representatives of the older generation and of Russian-speaking population were dissatisfied with selective method of the government: most of the street names that
reflected the Soviet and Russian historical heritage were changed, while exceptions were made for the streets named after communist party figures of Kazakh nationality (Isabaeva 2019).

Renamings on the basis of desovetisation slightly lost its relevance, and now a new subject causes discontent of the republic’s residents. As Kaşikçi (2019: 1345) notes, “the commemoration of historical figures is a prominent feature of the Kazakh urban landscape”, however, over the last three years, only one historical figure was commemorated a dozen times. In 2017, the Astana International Airport was renamed into Nursultan Nazarbayev International Airport, and one of the central streets of Almaty, Furmanov street, became Nazarbayev street. In 2019, immediately after Nazarbayev’s resignation, at the parliamentary private meeting it was decided to rename the capital into Nur-Sultan and the main streets in all cities of Kazakhstan - into Nazarbayev streets. Negative reaction of the population in response to the changes has grown like a snowball over the years: from generating a lot of jokes on social networks in 2017 (Vlast 2017) to mass protests against renaming the capital without taking into account the opinions of Kazakhstanis in 2019 (Shcherbakov 2019). Ironically, the State Program added the degree of public satisfaction with work of the onomastic commissions (82% by 2019) to the target indicators list. It included compliance with the principles of transparency and public access to the discussion of decision-making process.

2.2.5 Responding to the acquisition planning quandaries
Finally, the State Program suggested conscious acquisition planning based on resolving vital problems in the educational system of Kazakhstan. These problems are indicated both in the works of Kazakhstani scholars and in the State Education Development Program of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020 (2010). Firstly, formal education practices require to update teaching methodology. Nurbekova et al. (2018) especially highlight the need to introduce e-learning as a part of modernisation of teaching the Kazakh language. Secondly, deployment of innovative forms and methods of teaching involves development of teachers’ personality and their professional competence, prompting the introduction of creative teaching (Amirova et al. 2018). Akimenko’s (2017: 23) study shows that, in the process of learning English, the ability of
Kazakhstani school teachers to present educational materials interestingly is inferior to the ability of private tutors as students find their private English classes “more enjoyable” than school classes. Thirdly, the State Program for the Development of Education (2010: 16) made a remark about the insufficient quality of teacher training and shortage of highly qualified teaching staff. In the Kazakhstani society, teachers have a low social status and low wages, which contributes to the drain of well-qualified personnel. Fourthly, researchers highlight imperfections of textbooks on teaching languages. This is especially true for Kazakh and English, since before the independence, there were few good textbooks for teaching the Kazakh language (Kulzhanova 2012: 8), and until relatively recently, English was not a compulsory subject in schools. Zhetpisbayeva et al. (2016: 67) argue that the authors of Kazakhstani textbooks had no previous experience in developing materials for English language learning, and they were exposed to making methodological mistakes as well as facing a challenge of adopt the materials “to fit the specific Kazakhstani context”. Baigozhina and Tezekbayeva (2015: 58) characterise the quality of the Kazakh language textbooks by the lack of a communicative orientation, which is a big omission.

The State Program addressed the above issues via aiming at accomplishment of the following range of tasks: 1) improving and standardising the methodology of Kazakh language teaching; 2) further educational and methodological support of Russian language teaching system; 3) preservation of the wide educational space for teaching the English language; 4) development of the trilingual educational model. The use of words “improving” (2012: 11) and “development” (2012: 21) for the first and the forth points allude to the intent of policymakers in putting greater efforts to enhance teaching of Kazakh and to introduce the educational trilingualism. “Support” (2012: 20) and “preservation” (2012: 21) in the second and the third items indicate that the state considered systems of Russian and English teaching more stable and successful. Cornerstones in advancement of the educational framework were creative pedagogical endeavor encouragement and improvement of a new methodological basis for teaching the state language and of the quality of teaching Kazakh (e.g. teachers’ skills). The model of continuing education was regarded as of paramount importance. Its essence can be defined as mastering the state language at A1 level by primary school students, at A2 level by middle school students and so on, right up to mastery of the language at C1
level by postgraduates. Indicators of enhancement in Kazakh language teaching incorporated an increase in the number of grants provided for teachers training (500 people annually), an increase in the number of the Kazakh language learners (100% by 2019) and an increase in the share of events aimed at upgrading teachers qualification at the state language training centers (90% by 2019). The first two indicators are incapable of influencing the improvement of teaching methods, being simply targeted at attracting citizens to become either Kazakh language teachers or language learners.

One of the acquisition planning challenges was to incorporate cultural component in English learning. Though the role of learning about foreign culture in the context of foreign language acquisition is often overlooked (Warford and White 2012), several studies emphasise its value. Kopzhasarova and Shipitsyna (2017: 2), for instance, argue that “full knowledge of a foreign language as a means of intercultural communication is impossible without knowledge and familiarisation with the culture of the country of the studied language”. Akynova et al. (2014: 229) observe that Western culture reflected in TV programs, music and movies motivate Kazakhstani youth to learn the English language. In Kazakhstan, there is a need to teach English in schools and higher educational institutions by means of cultural approach (Baynieva et al. 2013; Kurmanaeva and Zhalelova 2016; Son 2018) and intercultural competence building (Burmagina 2014). Fahrutdinova et al. highlight the role of a dialogue of cultures in developing communicative competence of a foreign language (2014: 38). In their turn, Warford and White (2012: 411-412) criticise “the four F’s treatment of culture learning (food, folklore, festivals, and facts)”, which is very common among English language teaching approaches. At the same time, the scholars highlight and approve “learning experiences at the expense of richer use of authentic content and community connections” (Warford and White 2012: 412).

Being a part of English language learning, the State Program undertook to ensure interaction with a foreign language culture via organisation of cultural events. As examples of such events, the LPP document listed Foreign Cultures Days, exhibitions, screenings of feature films and documentaries in original language. For this task there was no prescribed indicator as it was probably included into mastering the English language due to inseparability of development of language abilities and familiarisation with culture.
The problem with introducing the trilingual model of education, i.e. implementation of English (along with Russian and Kazakh) as a medium of instruction, deserves special attention. The following issues were extracted from Abdykaimova (2019: 192-193) and Seitzhanova et al. (2015: 75-76): (i) a lack of professional and unified training programs for subject teachers who do not speak English, including trainings for teachers abroad; (ii) a lack of educational materials, especially textbooks, for the core disciplines in English; (iii) existing need of standardisation of state methodological support for polylingual education. Bearing in mind that development of the trilingual learning model is one of the most difficult tasks of the entire State Program, a set of the mentioned measures was surprisingly scarce. The LPP document focused particularly on the organisation of events aimed at promoting trilingual education and development and production of teaching aids for this educational model. Indicators to track the progress of these tasks were not provided.

The State Program offered a series of comprehensive and ambitious strategies that contributed to enforcing the official language policies in Kazakhstan. The document’s stated purpose was creating favorable conditions for harmonious coexistence and development of three languages in the country. Deriving from its aims and target indicators, however, it can be assumed that the State Program predominantly leaned in the direction of the Kazakh language promotion. Careful consideration of the target indicators formulation reveals that ability of the State Program to evaluate its tasks performance is rather constrained for a number of reasons. Firstly, indicators were not always formulated in a clear and straightforward manner, e.g. absent specification of the required levels of speaking competencies. Secondly, following the path of least resistance, the LPP document tended to track progress of measurable items, as it is the case with an increase in the number of Kazakh language teachers, which is completely unsuitable for assessing the teaching quality improvement. Thirdly, for multiple tasks of LPP, for instance, the implementation of the Latin script, there were no available indicators, which left any progress or regress in fulfillment of these aspects unobserved.
3. Research methodology

3.1 Data collection and sampling procedure

Attitudes towards language use and language planning activities were surveyed among university students, aged 17-35. The choice of this demographic group was based upon two factors: firstly, being very sensitive to fluctuations in relevance and status of languages, young people decide which languages to learn and use in private and public communication. Their decisions, consequently, may structure a language shift and redefine the direction of the official LPP (Harrison 2007, Mccarty et al. 2009, Shohamy 2006). Secondly, the government of Kazakhstan sought to nurture youth via instilling respect towards the state language coupled with promoting trilingualism among school and university students. As a result, during the last ten years a new generation of Kazakhstani citizens emerged - the youth that falls under the government’s influence and responds to the personal needs in terms of language use.

Two biggest cities of Kazakhstan, Almaty and Astana, were chosen as the location for data gathering. According to the Analytical report on the implementation of the principles of the Bologna process in the Republic of Kazakhstan (2018: 12), these two cities have the highest proportion of the high-ranked universities in the country that attract the largest number of students in Kazakhstan.

For data collection non-probability sampling was applied: respondents for the survey were recruited through the researcher’s personal network. Snowball sampling was chosen due to an easy process of recruiting respondents in a relatively short time span. It should be admitted, however, that the survey results are not representative for the whole student community of the country.

The main sample of 106 respondents consists of 68 (64,2%) female and 38 (35,8%) male respondents. The respondents were between the ages of 17 and 35 years (median age is 26 years). In terms of study place, students from Astana and Almaty were almost equally divided: 55 (51,9%) and 51 (48,1%) respectively. The majority of students (N=98, 92,5%) had urban background, and only eight of them (7,5%) were of rural background. The ethnic Kazakhs dominate in the sample (N=79, 74,5%), while the ethnic Russians (N=13, 12,3%) or respondents from other ethnic groups (for instance, Ukrainians, Uighurs, Koreans, Dungans, Belarusians, Uzbeks, Germans, Poles, N=14,
13.2%) constitute only about one fourth of the respondent pool. It is worth noting that, according to the official statistics on Kazakhstan population by the selected ethnic groups (Open data 2018), in 2018 the share of Kazakhs was equal 68%, and the shares of the ethnic Russians and other ethnic groups constituted 19.3% and 12.7% respectively. Thus, the sample matches this distribution to the certain extent.

Data collection during the current study was accomplished through the survey. The decision to choose a survey methodology was motivated by a number of factors. Initial design was to be physically present in Astana and Almaty and to gather the data by convenience sampling at universities of the two cities via asking students to fill out the questionnaire in the presence of the researcher. Unfortunately, at the stage of data gathering, in January, most universities in Kazakhstan had winter break, therefore, it was more convenient to create and disseminate the questionnaire online. Secondly, the survey format was selected because of time efficiency in terms of quick distribution (data collection started on January 13, 2020 and ended on January 31, 2020). Finally, closed type of questions enabled to analyse results statistically more easily. At the same time, survey as a tool for conducting research on LPP has several disadvantages. First of all, a lack of open-ended questions limits the deeper understanding of respondents. The second shortcoming is social desirability issue, when the given answers do not “represent the actual language behavior and the wider context but reflect the way the respondents would like to envision themselves” (Smagulova 2008: 460). Thirdly, when dealing with Likert-scale type of survey items, many respondents showed a tendency to choose the middle alternative. This choice may imply “I don’t know” or “not applicable” response (Hodge and Gillespie 2003: 47), making it difficult to distinguish which answer was originally meant by a respondent.

The questionnaire was created in Google Forms in Russian and Kazakh. Translation into two languages prevented exclusion of Kazakh-speaking respondents and provided students with an opportunity to choose for themselves the best conditions for a quick and full comprehension of the questionnaire. Google Forms was chosen as a software tool as it is the most well-known platform for conducting online survey in Kazakhstan. Otherwise, there would be a possibility that potential respondents would refuse to open a link to the unknown and “suspicious” website. Google Forms is also an appealing tool because of the way it displays answers to the researcher: it is possible to
(a) check the answers of a particular respondent individually, (b) check the answers for each question separately from other questions, and (c) see the statistics for the whole sample via diagrams and graphs that Google Forms creates automatically. Limitations of Google Forms are mostly connected to the technical development of the platform. It was not possible, for instance, to make one questionnaire in two languages using one link. The narrowness of the content box caused inconvenience for respondents as several response options were hidden, and students had to scroll to read them.

3.2 Survey design
Among various LPP aspects described in the State Program, I chose to investigate a limited number of tasks that may be considered as the most challenging ones. Firstly, these include long-term issues that the state has been dealing with for three decades, for example, an increase in the proficiency, prestige and dissemination of the Kazakh language. Secondly, these are problems connected to the relatively new LPP directions, e.g. trilingualism in education and the transition of the Kazakh language to the Latin script. Thirdly, moral and intellectual development of the population is facilitated through culture and education, therefore, issues regarding languages learning and media and literature translations in Kazakh are especially significant. Fourthly, several LPP aspects cause negative reaction of the population, for instance, a lack of support regarding the new script introduction and peaceful protests against renaming the capital of the country. Each of the selected issues was discussed in greater details in Chapter 2.

Derived from Bonnet’s (2002) language attitudes questionnaire as well as Smagulova’s (2008) language attitudes, competence and performance survey, the questionnaire consists of 60 items divided into seven thematic blocks:

1. Biographic data (13 items), including data on respondents’ age, gender, ethnicity, place of birth, education and the first language of respondents and their parents.

2. Language proficiency data, measuring spoken interaction and spoken production skills in Kazakh, Russian and English languages (1 item). The focus on spoken language skills was motivated by the language proficiency objectives emphasised in the State Program (see Chapter 2.2). Respondents were asked to tick all the statements that apply to their knowledge of Kazakh, Russian and English. The set of the so-called “can-do”-statements was formulated on the basis of the
proficiency levels described in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Self-assessment Grids (CEFR) 2020).

3. The first associations with Kazakh, Russian and English (3 items), eliciting positive, negative or neutral images of these languages. Responses to these questions depend on how respondents perceive these languages.

4. Attitudes towards corpus planning activities (the implementation of the Latin script in the Kazakh language and work of the onomastic commissions), along with the quality and the quantity assessment of specific work areas listed in the State Program, i.e. the quality and the quantity of Kazakh content in media, of literature translations in Kazakh and of cultural events in English. Additionally, negative associations with the Kazakh language were investigated in this block (16 items).

5. Attitudes towards Kazakh, Russian and English acquisition planning activities and trilingualism in the society and education (9 items).

6. Respondents’ perceptions of the role, status, usefulness and prestige of Kazakh, Russian and English (4 items).

7. Frequency of the Kazakh, Russian and English language use across a range of private and public domains (14 items).

The English version of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1.

Initial version of the survey included larger number of open-ended questions and focused on several additional work areas of the language policy, e.g. Kazakh subtitles and dubbing for movies and monitoring progress in learning Kazakh. The second block dedicated to language proficiency also included ten “can-do”-statements for each level (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2). During the piloting stage, many respondents reported that the questionnaire appeared to be too lengthy and complex. The first version of the survey was consequently revised: open-ended questions were reformulated and replaced by the closed type of questions, self-assessment test was simplified, and investigation of less relevant LPP subtopics was excluded.

3.3 Data processing and analysis
The research aims at investigating relations of the state language policies and the individual experiences with the Kazakh, Russian and English language use and attitudes
through nexus analysis, based on the framework presented in Scollon and Scollon (2004). Nexus analysis draws on how a certain occasion of language use fits into a nexus of practice, in our case, implementation of the state language policy. The analysis of the LPP implementation was conducted, taking into account (a) compliance of the planned level of language proficiency in Kazakh, Russian and English with the self-reported one, (b) respondents’ assessment and approval of specific actions and adopted decisions of the official LPP, and (c) compliance of perceptions about the languages and their prestige, the value of linguistic capital, etc. on the official macro and individual levels. Descriptive statistics and discourse-analytical method were also applied towards the data elicited from the questionnaire. The data was coded according to the following thematic categories: language proficiency, language preferences across a range of private and public domains, attitudes towards prestige, corpus and acquisition planning activities, attitudes towards the use of Kazakh, Russian and English and promotion of trilingualism.
4. Language use, proficiency and language attitudes among young Kazakhstansis: survey results and discussion

4.1 Spoken language proficiency

This Chapter contains a comparison of the objectives set by the State Program with the self-reported proficiency obtained from the survey data. As discussed in the Chapter 2.2, required levels of Kazakh, Russian and English competence were not specified for most target indicators. At the same time, during their studies, university students are expected to know Kazakh on B2 level, with the projection to achieve C1 level proficiency after graduation. The LPP document neither established competence levels for other languages nor demanded equal fluency of the population in three languages. However, school textbooks for graduating courses of Russian and English are likewise aimed at mastering B2 level. As the survey was completed by the Kazakhstansis currently enrolled at universities, one might expect them to have B2 level proficiency for Kazakh, Russian, and English. Therefore, it makes sense to compare the actual proficiency with the stated goals regarding B2 level for all languages.
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Figure 1. Self-reported language proficiency in Kazakh, Russian and English (in %)
The data reveals that slightly more than half (53.8%) possessed the Kazakh language knowledge on B2 level (see Figure 1). The same level of English proficiency is reported by 41.8% of students. Nearly the entire sample (95.6%) attained high proficiency in Russian. Only 18.7% acquire all three languages, Kazakh, Russian and English, on B2 level (this percentage is not visualised in the figure). In general, the actual competence of respondents meets half of the requirements of the State Program, i.e. regarding Russian and English proficiency.

In addition, proficiency of different nationalities in the Kazakh language will be discussed next. Figures that contain information on the language proficiency among the ethnic Kazakhs, the ethnic Russians and the representatives of other ethnicities can be found in Appendix 2. The knowledge of the state language among the Russians was relatively low (23.1% with B1) in contrast with the respondents of other ethnicities, who assessed their Kazakh language knowledge higher (41.7% with C1). The ethnic Kazakhs in the sample are divided into two groups, according to their native language: 53.6% with Kazakh as L1 and 46.4% of Kazakh/Russian bilinguals. Among them, the first group demonstrated better Kazakh language skills than the second group (91.6% and 48% with C1). Despite the fact that the study has not identified statistically significant associations between different ethnic groups and their spoken proficiency in Kazakh, the latest official census for 2009 showed the same the trends: Russians, along with Ukrainians and Germans, spoke Kazakh worse than other nationalities (Kazakhstan Census 2011: 23). The representatives of other ethnicities, in their turn, knew the language better but fell behind the ethnic Kazakhs (except for the Uzbeks and Uighurs, whose acquisition level was slightly lower than the level of the titular ethnicity). In general, it can be observed that different ethnic groups speak Kazakh worse than the titular ethnic group. From such an uneven distribution of the state language knowledge, it follows that the non-Kazakhs should actively focus on the state language acquisition. According to the survey results, Kazakh language skills differ significantly even among the monolingual and bilingual representatives of the titular ethnicity. There is a notable lack of studies describing and comparing Kazakh language proficiency of Kazakh bilinguals and monolinguals. Even the official census 2009 did not provide any information on the number and proportion of bilinguals among the population, not to mention their language competences. Investigating the difference in the state language
skills among Kazakh bilinguals and monolinguals, likewise among various ethnic groups, and finding causes of these differences constitute important future directions for the elaboration of strategy for increasing the Kazakh language competence among the Kazakhstani population.

4.2 Language use in private and public domains and dissemination of the Kazakh language

Findings regarding frequency of Kazakh, Russian and English use are presented in Table 2. As expected, Russian is still used on the daily basis by the majority of respondents. The data also shows that the usage of English only slightly concedes to the use of Kazakh.

Table 2. The reported frequency of use of Kazakh, Russian and English (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Couple of times a month</th>
<th>Very rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>45,3</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>94,3</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reveals the reported language use in various public and private domains. As can be observed, the Russian language prevails in all domains. Respondents used the English language mostly with friends and at work. This language was used quite frequently in the leisure and entertainment domain (while reading news and books, while watching videos, etc.), in fact, even more often than Kazakh. Respondents used the state language most often with parents and slightly less often with friends. The spare-time activity, where Kazakh was used most often, was listening to the music.

Looking at the areas that the State Program was specifically aimed at, i.e. the domains of mass media, literature and home, one cannot recognise the distribution of Kazakh as particularly successful.
Table 3. The usage of Kazakh, Russian and English in different domains (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily /</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Daily /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parents</td>
<td>37,7</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With siblings</td>
<td>35,8</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>60,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With grandparents</td>
<td>36,8</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>46,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>77,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With neighbours</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>17,9</td>
<td>21,7</td>
<td>69,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In administrative institutions</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>21,7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the service sector</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>67,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In medical institutions</td>
<td>14,2</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>69,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When watching movies/videos/TV series</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>88,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When using social networks</td>
<td>14,2</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>86,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When attending theatrical performances</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When listening to the radio</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When listening to the music</td>
<td>19,9</td>
<td>21,7</td>
<td>64,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When reading newspapers, magazines and information portals</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>81,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When reading books</td>
<td>14,2</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>79,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When playing computer games</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>61,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When surfing Internet</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>21,7</td>
<td>81,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language preferences while reading books and news are discussed in the first place. Respondents of the current survey can be labeled as reading youth: 43,4% stated that they read news in the newspapers, magazines, information portals (including the ones available online) several times a day, 17% do it at least once a day, and only one person (0,9%) reported that (s)he does not read at all. As for books, 76,4% of students read them at least once a week. About 40% of the sample read books every day. In general, the language preferences for the both reading activities are quite similar. The vast majority of students (about 80%) indicated that they read in Russian on everyday basis. Around five times less respondents (14-15%) reported about reading daily in Kazakh. 18,9% and 25,5% of students read books and news in English. Almost one-third of the sample (29,2%) never reads newspapers and magazines in the state language, and the number of respondents who do not read books is Kazakh is even bigger (36,8%). It is thus clear that among the young population the use of the Kazakh language in the media and literature spheres concedes not only to Russian but even to English.

Regarding family language practices, around 70% of respondents reported Russian to be the main language of communication with parents, and the number of students speaking Kazakh with parents was almost two times less (37,7%). Russian was also predominantly used with siblings and grandparents. Such results are not surprising, based on the fact that the comparison between the parents’ and respondents’ first languages (L1) demonstrate a generational language shift. The number of people whose L1 is the state language decreases in each subsequent generation. Kazakh is obviously not absent from the verbal repertoire of the respondents, although they speak this language from birth almost 10% less often, as compared with their parents (28,3% and 38,2% respectively). Russian as L1 was reported to be more spread among younger rather than older generation of Kazakhstani (40,6% and 29,7% respectively). The percentage of bilingual parents (25,5%) and children (24,5%) was approximately the same. Chi-square test has also showed the dependency ($\chi^2 = 0.03, p < 0.05$) between generations and Kazakh and Russian as L1, thus confirming the generational language shift.

The processes of books translation and the spread of the Kazakh language in media are certainly moving forward. In the new State Program 2020-2025, it is claimed that upon completion of the State Program 2011-2019 the broadcast volume in state
electronic and print media in Kazakh was 73%. Thus, the initial goal of reaching 72% can be considered overfulfilled. Examples of popular online news portals that have from several tens of thousands to several hundred thousand readers include web pages Radio Azattyq, Tengrinews, The Village, Malim.kz, Telegram channel @birgetekscereik, Youtube channel “Тил қеспек жоқ”, and Instagram pages @ztb_kazakhstan, @holanews.qaz, @negekz, and many others. One of the proofs for the increase in the number of translated books in the Kazakh language is the project “New humanitarian knowledge. 100 new textbooks in Kazakh” that implemented translation of the best world scientific sources on history, political science, sociology, philosophy, psychology, cultural studies, philology and economics (Talaspayeva 2018). Also in the beginning of February 2020, the publishing house “Steppe & WORLD Publishing” announced the release of the first Harry Potter book in Kazakh (Turysbekov 2020). This event is especially significant for development of translating children’s literature.

Nevertheless, the increase in the share of Kazakh language content in mass media and literature cannot ensure the demand of the population for Kazakh language products, which can be witnessed via the presented above language use in both spheres. People do not opt for reading the sources that produce larger quantities of information, they would rather prefer the sources providing information of the highest quality. As a way to examine the respondents’ assessment of the quality, topicality and originality of Kazakh language content in media and social networks, a seven-point scale was used (one being completely dissatisfied and seven being very satisfied). The mean values for all the mentioned characteristics were below the average, that is, 3,84 for the quality of mass media content in Kazakh, 3,79 for the topicality and 3,22, i.e. the lowest, for the originality. On an analogous scale the respondents provided an assessment of the quantity and the quality of translations and publishing of the world literature, encyclopedias, business and scientific literature into the Kazakh language. 13,2% evaluated the quantity above the average, 58,5% - below the average, and 28,3% went for the middle alternative. The quality of translations satisfied one-fifth of the sample (20,8%), more than a half (56,6%) considered that they were rather dissatisfied with it, and the rest (22,6%) were neutral. The mean values of the translations quantity and the quality (3,08 and 3,2 respectively) were below the average. The figures indicate that
mass media and literature in the Kazakh language cannot be distinguished by the highest quality.

The respondents’ additional comments echoed the opinion of scholars, noting the presence of a large number of errors in translations and reiterating the necessity of more books in Kazakh. One respondent, for example, claimed that while studying at the university in the Kazakh department, all the information he received from textbooks was in Russian, since there were no translations of historical books into Kazakh. Several respondents stated that it was difficult for them to understand book translations in the Kazakh language. It was conditioned, first of all, by a large number of errors and incorrect translations of single words, which distorted information and left a general “doubtful” impression of the translation quality. Secondly, incorrect translation of the whole sentences caused misunderstanding of texts in Kazakh, as evidenced in (1):

(1) Көп аудармаларда көптеген ғрамматикалық және синтаксистік қателер кездеседі. Сөйлем құрылуы мұрық болмаса, оқу, әрі мәғынасын түсіну қынға түседі.

Many translations have a lot of grammatical and syntactical errors. If a sentence structure is incorrect, it becomes difficult to read and understand its meaning.

The state should thus increase funding for book translations, improve their quality through the training of specialists and conduct readership surveys.

To sum up, when it comes to any social interaction, distribution and use of Russian obscures the Kazakh language. Concerning the language use in free time, Kazakh is inferior not only to Russian but also to English. The only exception is theatrical performances, where the usage of Kazakh exceeds the use of English, perhaps primarily because English theatre productions are rare in Kazakhstan. It can be concluded that the State Program has proven ineffective for expanding the functions of Kazakh in the society, and it is necessary to continue working on dissemination of the state language in the domains of family, mass media and literature as in any other domain. Additionally, policymakers should prioritise not only the formation of the Kazakh language environment in media and literature spheres but rather the creation of
competitive products, improving their quality and originality in order to attract a larger audience.

4.3 Attitudes towards prestige planning activities

4.3.1 The first associations with the Kazakh, Russian and English languages

At the very beginning of the survey, respondents were asked to write two or three associations with the Kazakh, Russian and English languages. This made it possible to determine which images enshrined in the consciousness of respondents were associated with the three languages. A common feature among the answers for each language was cultural associations: sights, famous personalities in literature, politics, music, as well as traditional cuisine, etc. Such symbolic representations of the countries where these languages are spoken occurred frequently (Table 4, where “Total N” refers to absolute number of occurrences), however, each language was characterised by specific properties that are inherent to these languages.

Drawing from associations with English, respondents perceived the language as the opportunities opener, the embodiment of modernity and the necessity. They often connected the language with “perspectives”, “opportunities”, “advantage”, along with more concrete examples of what English offers opportunities for: “(desired) job”, “professional”, “career”, “Work and Travel”, “travelling”, “tourism”, “education”, “new acquaintances”, “access to information”, “music”, “movies”, “TV series”, “without subtitles”. In addition, unlike other languages, English in the minds of respondents was linked with economic, scientific and technological progress in the world. It can be witnessed from a number of associations, e.g. “modern”, “development”, “tendencies”, “computer”, “society”, “globalisation”, “the world”, “Internet”, “modern science”. The general mood related to this language can be described as positive and playful (“cool”, “bright”, “big smile”, “enjoyment”, “interesting”). Finally, respondents labeled English as the “necessity” more often than Kazakh or Russian.

Abundance of linguistic means and proximity to respondents were revealed as the properties of the Russian language. Such associations as “accompanying”, “ubiquity”, “daily occurrence”, “nothing special”, “daily routine”, “habituation”, “common”, “social environment” indicated that students considered Russian to be a part
Table 4. The most frequent associations with Kazakh, Russian and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associations</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Associations</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Associations</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>native</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pushkin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>the USA/ America</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>richness/ rich, Russia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>travelling</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>literature</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>native</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>easy</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditions, Kazakhstan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>convenient / convenience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Britain/ the UK</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steppe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>easy, swearing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>necessity, work/ job</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richness/ rich, warmth, yurt, village, obligation/ obligatory, state language, beshbarmak, baursaks, literature, Astana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>routine, orthography/ orthographic, school, family, home, bear, vodka, borsch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>freedom, New York, tea, international</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture, cases, historical/ history, Baiterek, horse, jokes/ memes, book, South, dialects, kumis, grandmother</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>international, teacher, social environment, grammar, blini, rules, Tolstoy, explanatory dictionary, St. Petersburg, forest, books, Putin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“London is the capital of Great Britain”, future, professional, tenses, globalisation, abroad, science, IELTS, British accent, British flag</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modern, studying, access to information, perspectives, fast, university, the world, interesting, book, understandable, cat, prevalence, difficult, dictionary, Obama, Trump, the Queen of England, music, TV shows, foreigner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of their lives and did not deem it an alien language. High culture that is perceived to be intrinsic to Russian speakers can be illustrated via the presence of such associations as “eloquence”, “communication culture”, “respect”, “aristocratic”, “literacy”, “politeness”. Flexibility and abundance of the language are demonstrated by means of not only the famous expression “great and mighty” but also “diverse”, “writing style”, “book language”, “abundance of language”, “beautiful structures”, “laconic”, “making up new words”. At the same time, Russian was considered to be rich not only in literary expressions as it was occasionally associated with profanity. This aspect, along with the mentioned complexity of the language, constituted its negative features.

Associations with Kazakh signaled emotional attachment of respondents to the language: “gratitude”, “relaxation”, “patriotism”, “spiritual wealth of the world”, “native”, “heartwarming”. It is also worth noting that the youth expressed negative attitudes towards Kazakh more often than towards other languages. These negative associations included, first of all, a frequently occurring characteristic “difficult”, and secondly, various issues connected to the language learning and use: “little-known”, “isolation”, “a lot of obscure words in literature as most of them are no longer used”, “stupid textbooks”, “few people know literary Kazakh”, “boredom”, “rude”, “mambets”, “nationalism”, “nasty faces of Kazakh teachers who do not like Kazakhs who do not speak their own native language”. Such references indicate that students recognised the existence of the most pressing problems connected to the language.

4.3.2. Perceptions and prestige of Kazakh, Russian and English

Quite obviously, the first associations reflected general perceptions of these languages in the Kazakhstani society rather than conveyed value and importance of a particular language for respondents. Significance of a language can be identified by paying attention to how much, in the students’ opinion, its knowledge expands their opportunities and gives advantages in getting a better job or obtaining further education. 83.8% of respondents reported that it was important for them to know English for further education, 73.6% stated the same about Russian, and 45.3% - about Kazakh. 93.4% deemed mastering English rather important for the better chance to get a job, 84% applied it to Russian, and 64.1% - to Kazakh. Based on these percentages and respondents’ associations of the English language with work opportunities, it follows
that the youth did consider English as the language of business communication, as planned in the State Program. The level of prestige of the English language among Kazakhstani students was indeed the highest, and Kazakh was at the lowest position in this respect.

As for the immediate task of the State Program to create the prestigious image of Kazakh language native speakers, it cannot be argued that media coped with it. 19,8% agreed with the statement “The majority of successful people in Kazakhstan speak Kazakh”, the rest either disagreed (45,3%) or were neutral (34,9%). By comparing Kazakh with other languages, it becomes clear that it is “out of their league”. The majority (59,4%) perceived people who mastered English or Russian as more prestigious than those who knew Kazakh, and only 14,1% disagreed with it. The results suggest that Kazakh have remained overshadowed by the high status of other languages.

Figure 2. Languages that respondents intend to use with their children

In relation to the State Program aim to position the Kazakh language as a family value, respondents were asked whether they wanted their future children to know Kazakh. The overwhelming majority of students (89%) responded positively.
Answering the question “Which language(s) will you use with your future children?”, however, 40.6% did not mention Kazakh at all (see Figure 2). Less than one-third of the young Kazakhstani were willing to raise their children in monolingual setting (Kazakh or Russian only). The most common answer was “Kazakh, Russian and English” (34%). Except these three languages, several foreign ones (Chinese, French, German, Spanish, Turkish, Polish) were mentioned by 7.5%, while 2.8% of respondents belonging to the national minorities group indicated their mother tongues (Tatar, Uzbek, German).

The willingness of young Kazakhstani to support the use of Kazakh among their future children does not guarantee that it will be put into practice. Transmission of the Kazakh language by parents to children is simply not possible, if parents themselves do not acquire this language, especially taking into consideration the decline in the number of people with Kazakh as L1. This situation creates a paradox (“I cannot speak Kazakh with my children, but I want them to know the language”), being a possible reason as to why the desired family language policy could be difficult to arrange.

In addition, the State Program envisioned mastering the Kazakh language as a factor of the national unity strengthening and as a duty of every Kazakhstani citizen. More than one-third of the sample (36.8%) felt that the Kazakh language strengthened unity of all nationalities living in Kazakhstan, 24.5% did not share this feeling, and the rest (38.7%) were neutral. Regarding the perception of Kazakh as a duty, half of respondents (51.9%) believed that to know the state language was obligatory for all residents of the country, 19.8% disagreed with this, and 28.3% opted for the middle alternative. As can be seen, inculcation of perceiving Kazakh as a unity strengthening factor and as a duty was effective only for a portion of the population, which is insufficient to declare success in the implementation of these two tasks of the State Program.

When investigating the next goal of the State Program, students were asked whether the use of the Kazakh language had ever evoked any negative associations. 52.8% of the sample replied “never”, 33% had these associations only sometimes, and 14.2% reported to have them quite often. Thus, the task of excluding negative associations with Kazakh can be considered half completed. The respondents were also asked to specify what context of the language use provoked negativity. Two most common answers were condemnation of respondents for not knowing the language and
the so-called mambetism. The first case implies censure and reprimands to those ethnic Kazakhs whose Kazakh language skills are limited. The youth reported being humiliated, neglected and discriminated by other Kazakh speakers who possessed higher communicative competence. At worst, it could start from school, as one respondent recalled in (2):

(2) В начальных классах учителя и учительницы кричали на нас за то, что мы не знаем своего языка. А причём мы здесь тут? (...) Это результат многодесятилетней политики и содомии, плоды которого мы (наше поколение, 1990- ) имели несчастье пожинать.

In primary school, teachers shouted at us for not knowing our language. And what does it have to do with us? (...) This is the result of multi-year policy and sodomy, the consequences of which we (our generation, 1990-) have the misfortune to reap.

Discrimination on the basis of language skills may have profound implications for learning motivation deficiency: one respondent noted that humiliations discouraged her from learning Kazakh and drew a parallel between Kazakh speakers and foreign language speakers, as seen in (3):

(3) Я владею английским и немецким языком, и всегда иностранцы рады что я говорю с ними на их языке и стараются поддержать и стимулировать, а не критиковать.

I speak English and German, and foreigners are always glad that I speak their language to them and try to support and stimulate rather than criticise me.

Manifestation of the lack of culture and politeness by Kazakh speakers, which was the second reason that caused negative associations with the Kazakh language use among respondents, is called mambetism. There is no unequivocal definition for this concept: Grishchenko (2009: 334) adds illiteracy to the traits of mambetism, Segizbayeva and Bekbosynova (2017: 89) operationalise it as a phenomenon that is characteristic of people from rural areas, and Dmitryuk et al. (2015: 277) associate it with ethnocentrism. In this study, however, I will consider mambetism as demonstration of discourtesy by Kazakh native speakers through the excessive use of profanity. Respondents expressed
the opinion that the presence of profanity distorted and spoiled the beauty of the Kazakh language. Acknowledging that it is unpleasant to encounter swear words in any language, it is hard to attribute this aspect as a disadvantage of the Kazakh language in particular. The last category of negative associations was connected with teaching and learning the language: incompetence of teachers, dissatisfaction with the quality of Kazakh language textbooks and “formality of education”, meaning that while having good grades in the Kazakh language courses in schools and at universities, youth still cannot fluently speak the language.

The position of the Russian language in the society is ambiguous. The former President Nazarbayev repeatedly evaluated the knowledge of Russian as an advantage of the Kazakhstani people, not a drawback (Abdykaimova 2019: 193-194), and proclaimed preservation of linguistic diversity as the goal of the official LPP of the republic. Meanwhile, Russian is widely used in the society instead of Kazakh. With this state of affairs, it is worthwhile to find out whether respondents believe that Russian interferes with the promotion of the state language (Table 5).

Table 5. Respondents’ opinion on Kazakh-Russian relations and the role of these languages in the society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly/ rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly/ rather agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The use of Russian suppresses the spread of Kazakh in many spheres of life.</td>
<td>22,7%</td>
<td>37,7%</td>
<td>39,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kazakh language has been weakening the spread of the Russian language lately.</td>
<td>34,9%</td>
<td>36,8%</td>
<td>28,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s important for Kazakh to replace Russian as the language of interethnic communication in future.</td>
<td>55,7%</td>
<td>21,7%</td>
<td>22,7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of those who neither agreed nor disagreed with the first two statements was quite large. Around 40% of respondents acknowledged that Russian interfered with Kazakh, and one-third of the sample disagreed that in the recent past Kazakh had managed to lessen the influence of Russian. The students also rather disagreed that the
state language should replace Russian in the field of interethnic communication. Since the independence, for about thirty years, the Russian language has played this role in the society. The State Program 2020-2025 envisages a new direction in LPP - an intention to expand the functioning of the Kazakh language as the language of interethnic communication in Kazakhstan. Young people stating that they were not willing to deprive the Russian language of this status displayed that the society could be unprepared for the change.

Students expressed their attitudes more confidently, when trilingualism was considered as a personality trait rather than a component of the state language policy (Table 6). More than one-third of respondents reckoned that the state should continue to promote trilingualism. Half of the sample regarded the knowledge of three languages as the key element for development of Kazakhstan, and the vast majority assessed trilingualism as a potential advantage for themselves. In general, it can be concluded that the young population is more likely to support the concept of trilingualism and its promotion. The respondents’ attitudes to trilingualism in education as a part of the official LPP are discussed in greater detail in the Chapter 4.5.1.

Table 6. Attitudes of the respondents towards trilingualism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly/rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly/rather agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government should decrease putting the emphasis on trilingualism promotion.</td>
<td>37,8%</td>
<td>39,6%</td>
<td>22,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trilingualism is the key of our country’s development.</td>
<td>14,2%</td>
<td>32,1%</td>
<td>53,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally for me, it would be useful to master Kazakh, Russian and English (all three).</td>
<td>3,7%</td>
<td>14,2%</td>
<td>82,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It emerges from the foregoing that, firstly, among the three languages, Kazakh has the lowest level of prestige. Successful Kazakhstani citizen is perceived in the minds of respondents as a person who is able to speak English rather than Kazakh. Despite the low prestige rate and the presence of negative associations with the state
language, the ethnic Kazakhs aspired to preserve and use it as the family language. A proportion of respondents also referred to this language knowledge as obligatory and unifying attribute of Kazakhstani residents. Secondly, the youth did not feel the need in replacing Russian as the dominant language of interethnic communication. Thirdly, the young population was more likely to support trilingualism policy, since they acknowledged mastering three languages as useful. Closeness of Russian to respondents and importance of knowing English for better career opportunities overlapped with the images of these languages instilled by the State Program. Finally, the survey illustrates that the state’s ideology of Kazakhization, which is aimed at the Kazakh language promotion, occasionally has exactly the opposite effect. When supporters of this ideology propagate it too eagerly, this may cause a negative reaction among the youth and even demotivate them from learning the language. Inherently, the position “Kazakhs should speak Kazakh” is correct: O’Callaghan (2005: 211) explains that in order to make all nationalities in the country speak Kazakh, it is worth starting with the titular ethnicity: “Once the majority of Kazakhs are using language freely it will come to play a dominant role in the society. Then and only then can a case be made for assimilation”. However, if pressure exerted on the ethnic Kazakhs is not reduced, the prestige of the state language could deteriorate. In any case, as Kircher (2016: 5) argues, “language planning rarely achieves its intended aims if it lacks attitudinal support at the grassroots level”. Drawing from this, the state should actively continue to focus on increasing the prestige of Kazakh and ensuring positive attitudes of its speakers towards the language.

4.4 Attitudes towards corpus planning activities

4.4.1 Implementation of the Latin script in the Kazakh language

In order to examine attitudes towards the transition to the Latin script, respondents were offered to choose whether they agreed with a number of statements naming positive and negative aspects of the script reform. In total, 165 positive and 207 negative statements were ticked. Students increasingly opted for following statements: “It is a waste of money and time” (45.3%); “The reform will cause even greater slowdown in the process of introducing the Kazakh language as the state language” (35.8%); “The Kazakh
language will become even more difficult to learn” (34.9%). The most frequently chosen positive statement was “The reform is a positive change since all new technologies are based on the Latin script” (29.2%). It is impossible, however, to unequivocally identify whether students supported the reform or not as a significant quantity of respondents provided mixed answers that contained both supportive and disapproving arguments.

The distribution of the new script is one of the most recent tasks of the Kazakhstan’s LPP, therefore, the government should not anticipate quick progress in its implementation. According to the gathered data, the Latin script has not come into extensive use among the young population. 9.4% of respondents used the Latin script at least once a day while texting, 26.4% reported doing it rarely, and more than a half (52.8%) did not use the new script while texting at all. In handwritten notes students used the script even less frequently: 3.7% - at least once a day, 17% - less than once a month, and 72.6% never used it. As the reasons for not employing the Latin script, students indicated the following: “I am not used to it / I am used to Cyrillic” (34.6%), “I do not want to/ I do not accept it/ I do not get the point of it” (16%), “The Latin script is inconvenient for me” (11.1%), “I have not fully mastered the Kazakh letters in Latin” (12.3%), “There is no need for me to use it” (12.3), “Nobody uses the Latin script / Since it is not widespread in the society” (11.1%) and “I rarely use the Kazakh language / I do not write in Kazakh at all” (8.6%).

There are two more issues of the reform that should be addressed by policymakers. First of all, there is a need to rethink the new script itself. Several respondents expressed their support of the transition, while simultaneously insisting on making the alphabet more convenient for its users:

(4) Өзгеріс өркішан керек, бастысы жақсы мен тіімді болу керек.

Changes are always needed, and the main thing for them is to be good and convenient.

The first step to solve the problem is to recognise its existence, and two years after the reform adoption this step was taken by the current President Tokayev. In October 2019, in his Twitter he acknowledged the shortcomings of the new script and announced further work on its improvement (Tokayev 2019). The next step is to apply a scientific
approach for solving the issue via taking into account scholars’ pieces of advice and other countries’ experience in script switching, as suggested by the respondents, in order to develop a proper version of the new script. Secondly, since the reform bears the top-down character, it is crucial to motivate the population to learn and use the Latin script. With passive or negative attitudes of Kazakhstanis demonstrated in the survey, the transition may proceed harder and longer.

### 4.4.2 Satisfaction with work of the onomastic commissions

Considering negative attitudes of the republic’s citizenry towards renaming practices of geographical objects for the last three years (discussed in Chapter 2.2), it is not surprising that the level of support of the onomastic commissions work by respondents was low (Table 7). Almost 40% of the youth estimated that renaming of administrative-territorial objects was widely covered by media. In the case of the remaining statements, the number of respondents who disapproved the work in a given area of LPP outweighed the number of those who approved it.

#### Table 7. The level of support regarding the work of the onomastic commissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly / rather disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly / rather agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The official renaming practices of geographical objects are transparent and justified in Kazakhstan.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37,7%</td>
<td>12,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle of taking into account public opinion regarding the official renaming practices is often violated.</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
<td>23,6%</td>
<td>74,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media is widely involved into the process of the official renaming practices of geographical objects.</td>
<td>19,8%</td>
<td>42,5%</td>
<td>37,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, I’m satisfied with work of the commissions responsible for the official renaming of geographical objects.</td>
<td>61,3%</td>
<td>27,4%</td>
<td>11,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I approve most of the new names given to geographical objects.</td>
<td>51,9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most striking observation is that approximately three-quarters of the sample reported on a breach of the principle of public opinion consideration. Despite the intended 82%, only 11.3% of the students were satisfied with work of the onomastic commissions.

It is noteworthy that from the entire list of target indicators, the discussed one was relatively easy to achieve. Online media, however, periodically publishes articles about complaints of Kazakhstani residents on city administrations that ignore public opinion about renaming streets (Tengrinews 2019; Otyrar 2019, Sputnik 2020). In general, respondents did not object to the very need for renaming administrative-territorial objects, however, inability of the government to cooperate with the public is widely disapproved. Ironically, a list of objectives of the State Program 2020-2025 (2019) regarding changes of ideologically obsolete onomastic names does not include adherence to the principle of transparency and taking into account public opinion.

4.5 Attitudes towards acquisition planning activities

4.5.1 The quality of language education and the trilingual model of education

Students assessed the quality of their Kazakh, Russian and English language classes (teaching itself) in schools and at universities on a scale from one to seven. The mean value of the quality of English classes at universities (4.4) was higher than in schools (3.7). The opposite trend was valid for teaching Kazakh and Russian: at universities (4.3 and 5.2 for these languages respectively) they were rated lower than in schools (4.7 and 5.7 respectively). Overall, lessons of Russian were evaluated as of the highest quality in both types of educational institutions. In schools, teaching English was estimated as the worst, while at universities, the quality of Kazakh and English lessons were almost equally poor.

Further, respondents indicated whether they had encountered any problems in terms of qualification of language teachers, modernisation of language classes, creativity of language classes and the textbooks quality. Russian language classes received the least remarks (112 in total), whereas difference in the number of remarks on the quality of Kazakh and English classes was insignificant (158 and 150 remarks respectively). Generally, Modernisation (115) and Creativity of classes (130) were
reported to be the most problematic aspects, and Qualification of language teachers (82) and Textbooks quality (93) were least problematic. Kazakh teaching received the significant majority of complaints for three out of four parameters: Modernisation of classes (46), Creativity of classes (51) and Textbooks quality (41). English teaching was the worst from the perspective of Qualification of language teachers (46). Teaching Russian was highly rated in almost all parameters, except Creativity of classes (41), where it slightly conceded to English (38).

Among other thorny issues in teaching languages, respondents highlighted the lack of native speakers as English educators, incorrect attitudes of teachers to their work coupled with their inability to motivate students to learn languages. The first argument is rather associated with the low qualification issue: students observed a low level of English proficiency among local educators and expressed the need to recruit foreigners. The second important point was schools and universities staff indifference, on the one hand, or overzealousness, on the other, in relation to teaching languages:

(5) Преподаватели даже не стараются [английский] подать, как хорошо что я в своё время была няшей-умняшей и учил ее самостоятельно по комиксам. А преподаватели казахского языка очень часто low key националисты и любят грубить за то, что у тебя не получается.

Teachers do not even try to teach English properly, it is good that I used to be a cute smart little girl and learnt it independently via comic books. And teachers of the Kazakh language are very often low key nationalists and like being rude, when you are not good at something.

Prejudicial treatment of the titular ethnicity representatives towards the respondents due to the poor knowledge of the Kazakh language, which was addressed in Chapter 4.3, is a frequent phenomenon that may provoke discouragement of the young people from learning the language. Finally, the third argument regarding teacher’s inability to motivate students was most likely to refer to the state language educators. When pointing out what kind of motivations prompted respondents to learn Kazakh, Russian and English, the data revealed a curious contrast: learning English was primarily motivated by the interest towards the language (69,8%), while referring to the Kazakh language, 52,8% indicated the obligatory nature of learning. Teachers, in their turn, are
in a position to arouse and maintain a minimal level of interest among students towards the Kazakh language.

67 respondents out of 106 (63.2%) gave an affirmative answer to the question “Have you experienced the trilingual model of education yourself?”. Among them about two-thirds (62.7%) liked this experience, noting the creation of favorable conditions for multifaceted development of an individual:

(6) Это более познавательно, твой мозг начинает работать усердней, дабы переводить язык и усваивать информацию.
This is more enlightening, your brain begins to work harder in order to translate the language and absorb information.

When the statement “I support trilingualism in education because it’s a good possibility to learn Kazakh, Russian and/or English better” was commended to the attention of respondents, more than twice as many students agreed than disagreed with it (46.2% and 20.8% respectively). A substantial number of those who did not like their experience with trilingual education noted the insufficient level of teachers language training and the incapacity to teach other subjects in English:

(7) Чтобы вести урок на том же английском языке нужно свободно владеть им. Для этого нужен преподаватель совершенно другого качества. Который побывал за рубежом, который свободно работает с учебником на английском языке.
To conduct a lesson in English, one needs to be fluent in it. For this, a teacher should be of a completely different quality. We need teachers who have been abroad and who work freely with textbooks in English.

Students who agreed with the statement “The trilingual model of education is very confusing because in the end you don’t master neither subjects taught in different languages nor the languages themselves” (41.5%) outnumbered by two times those who disagreed with it (21.7%). Respondents quite logically assumed that if one does not speak the language of instruction, it would be difficult for him or her to understand not only certain topics but even basic concepts of a subject. One respondent shared her experiences from school time:
I studied in fucking NIS, and all of these innovations were tested on us. As one can imagine, their piloting was fucked up, because when Kazakh became the language of instruction for the lessons of the history of Kazakhstan, there were no excellent students left in the group.

Among those who did not encounter this model of education, there were approximately equal number of people who wanted (17.9%) and would not want to try it (18.9%).

Despite the fact that the State Program focused solely on enhancing the quality of the Kazakh language classes, there is an increasingly urgent need to improve the quality of English teaching, especially to upgrade educators’ English language skills. Modernisation and insertion of a creative component should be carried out in Kazakh language classes in schools and at universities, and the state should provide the production of better textbooks. Motivation of students in learning Kazakh and eradication of bullying by language teachers also deserve special attention. The students’ support of trilingualism in education is particularly noteworthy, however, due to the deficiency in English language skills among students and teachers, the trilingual model is occasionally considered to be confusing.

4.5.2 Organisation of culture events in English

Since the State Program did not prescribe any target indicators for this task implementation, I simply examined opinion of respondents on its performance. More than half of the sample (55.7%) reported on the participation in cultural events in English organised by embassies and American Corners (American-style cultural centres that provide access to materials for English language learning and to speaking clubs). Among the respondents who took part in such events, 41.5% preferred participation in movies screening, 29.2% - in exhibitions, 21.7% - in Foreign Cultures Days and 3.8% - in conferences, including the ones organised by universities. Less widespread types of attended events included speaking clubs, internships, cinema festivals, seminars and student activities.
48,1% of the sample were satisfied with the events frequency and the quality of their organisation, while 21,7% expressed the contrary view, and 30,2% found it difficult to evaluate the mentioned aspects or simply left the field unanswered. Cultural activities were acknowledged useful as they greatly facilitated the language learning process by means of maintaining and developing students’ communicative competence in English. It is especially valuable, given that in their daily life, respondents more frequently deployed receptive English language skills, reading and listening, in comparison with other languages, as demonstrated in Appendix 3.

English events were reported to provide a wide variety of interesting content. Additionally, one respondent described them as “interesting events without Kazakh patriotic praises that are peculiar to other events” (интересные мероприятия без фирменного казахского ура патриотизма). Usually the majority of the official events, which are always held in both Kazakh and Russian, contain a patriotic message and consolidation of the Kazakhstani identity, which is not observed in the events held in English. Perhaps this feature is what attracts the young people to such events, being a breath of fresh air among a series of monotonous events that persistently promote Kazakhstani values.

At the same time, 15,2% of participants noted the necessity in increasing the frequency of the cultural events, especially in cities other than Astana. 3,8% reported that, on the contrary, the events in English were held quite often. Contradictory information was obtained about the events organisation: there was an equal split of students who assessed the high level of the organisational part and of respondents who stated that the quality of the events can be improved. While one respondent commented on a low level of English performed during such events, another admitted the conformity with an international level. I can assume that such controversial answers were provided due to different circumstances and purposes of the events. Various international exhibitions, competitions, etc. quite often take place in Astana and Almaty, and in this case, spectators and visitors anticipate event organisers to have a perfect command of English. There are smaller events held locally, for instance, at universities, and the following comment (9) is most likely related to the assessment of events belonging to this category:
(9) Всё банально. Нет носителей языка. Информация обычно подается через ведущих, хотя мы тоже можем читать Википедию и брать информацию.

Everything is banal. No native speakers. Information is usually provided through facilitators, although we too can read Wikipedia and get the information ourselves.

Cultural events in English proved to be a helpful tool for the English language acquisition. For this reason, it is relevant for the state to make special arrangements for such events organisation with an intention to involve more participants. The survey also indicated the need in their proliferation, preferably not only in large cities of Kazakhstan but also in smaller towns and villages.
5. Conclusion

Throughout the thesis work, I have attempted to demonstrate ways in which the actual Kazakh, Russian and English language use and attitudes relate to specific tasks of the State Program. This relationship is important to identify whether the official language policy goals for years 2011-2019 were accomplished. The State Program 2020-2025 claims that 100% of the target indicators and 83.3% of the performance indicators planned by the previous State Program were successfully achieved (2019: 7). Yet, the survey results suggest that the impeccable performance of several target indicators might be contested.

One of the most persuasive examples of this is the respondents’ communicative competences in three languages. The knowledge of Russian and English corresponded to the level required by the State Program, while the criteria for Kazakh proficiency and a related set of proficiencies in three languages were not fulfilled. Overall, Russian language skills were considerably higher than skills in other languages, and the students reported having poorer command of English in comparison with Kazakh.

Kazakhstani policymakers had an especially difficult task to disseminate the state language across social space in various contexts. It is particularly noteworthy that expansion of Kazakh in social life of the country’s citizenry was partially constrained at the expense of employing Russian on daily basis and of the widespread usage of English in the leisure and entertainment domains. Despite the progress made in the establishment of Kazakh language media outlets and the translation of literature into Kazakh, the young population was more often inclined to use Russian or English, when reading books and news. Above all, the data demonstrated the students’ commitment to Kazakh language practices in the family domain, although respondents’ willingness to speak Kazakh does not entail the actual language use.

Respondents’ perceptions of the Russian and English languages reflected the ones conceived by the State Program, in particular, regarding envisioning English as the language of business communication and Russian as the language that is present in the communicative and informational space of the country. In terms of considering the Kazakh language knowledge as the entire population’s duty and the token of unity, only a minor proportion of students perceived it this way. Within the prestige hierarchy,
creation of educational and professional opportunities by and high societal demand in English and Russian has resulted in sidelining the prestigious image of Kazakh speakers that the State Program sought to instill. To increase the prestige rate of Kazakh requires elimination of the negative stereotypes assigned to the language, e.g. removal of discrimination against Kazakh native speakers as well as enhancement of the state language teaching system.

Indeed, when referring to Kazakh language teaching, the research participants pointed out the need to modernise language classes, to foster creativity skills among educators and to improve the quality of learning materials. In addition to facilitating the Kazakh language acquisition, the importance of developing English language education was emphasised: a high degree of dissatisfaction with professional qualification of teachers was expressed by the students. Cultural events in English were assessed positively as participation in the events was reported to improve English competence, and respondents were interested in more frequent organisation of such events.

One of the problems in the implementation of corpus planning activities is that, while an extremely small proportion of the youth employed the Latin script of the Kazakh language, this is hardly sufficient for declaring the effective performance of the script reform. Elaboration of more convenient script should serve as primary focus of Kazakhstani linguists and policymakers. As the young population predominantly did not consider the reform necessary and reckoned it a waste of time and money, scant attention should also be paid to motivating and training on the Latin script use. Dissatisfaction with work of the onomastic commissions was another concern that was highlighted by many respondents. This target indicator realisation was evaluated considerably lower than it had been planned by the State Program. Ignoring public opinion and failure to adhere to the principle of transparency had resulted in a lack of support for renaming practices.

The achievements in societal and educational trilingualism promotion deserve credit. Approval of the trilingual educational model by the youth and considering the integrated knowledge of Kazakh, Russian and English languages as a desirable personal characteristic conformed to the attitudes instilled by the State Program.

From all of the above, it becomes clear that the stated language policy and actual language use and attitudes overlap to a certain extent, yet the elimination of
discrepancies between these dimensions is still to be carried out. Drawing from the findings of this research, I would suggest the following recommendations for the government of Kazakhstan:

1) increasing the Kazakh language proficiency among the young population, especially among non-Kazakhs;
2) disseminating Kazakh in various private and public domains;
3) producing original and competitive content in Kazakh language media as well as a large quantity of well-translated literature in Kazakh;
4) ensuring high-quality teaching of Kazakh and English in schools and at universities;
5) improving the trilingual model of education;
6) creating a more convenient version of the Latin script of the Kazakh language, educating and motivating the population to use it;
7) enhancing the prestige and positive perception of the Kazakh language.

When setting LPP goals, Kazakhstani policymakers, among other things, should:
- appeal not to the quantity of LPP activities held or money invested but rather to the quality of goals implementation;
- avoid inaccurate and vague formulations of goals and target indicators;
- set feasible, elaborate and realistic goals - even if they are less ambitious - in accordance with the evaluation and analysis of the current linguistic situation in the country;
- take into account preparedness and attitudes of the population regarding any changes and innovations in the LPP of Kazakhstan.

While conducting the present study, several limitations have become apparent. Firstly, choosing survey as a tool for conducting the research on language policy entails social desirability issue, as discussed in Chapter 3.1. Ethnographic observations or method of interview would more effectively address the issue. Another limitation pertains to non-probability sampling that was applied for recruiting the respondents. Given the fact that the survey results are not representative for the entire population of the republic, it is necessary to conduct a large-scale investigation of the current LPP efficacy. Finally, only a limited number of aspects of the State Program have been examined. A possible direction for future research thus is to expand the horizon of the
analysis and to evaluate the implementation of other numerous directions of the LPP document that were not mentioned in this paper.
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Appendix 1: The student questionnaire form

Dear participant,

The following survey is conducted as a part of my MA thesis project on language policy and planning in Kazakhstan. Your participation is highly appreciated and very important for the success of the project. The survey is anonymous, and the data you provide is used for academic purposes and processed according to the ethical standards. The survey may take some time to fill (approximately 20 min). You can answer the survey in Kazakh or Russian. If you have any questions, comments or feedback you can contact me via email (imma_elph@mail.ru) or Vkontakte (https://vk.com/sevlabradydel).

Thank you for your participation!
Anna Klimchenko

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age: ....................
2. Sex:  O Male  O Female  O Other.
3. Nationality:  O Kazakh  O Russian  O Other (specify): ......................
4. What is your region of birth?
   O Akmola region
   O Aktobe region
   O Almaty region
   O Atyrau region
   O East Kazakhstan region
   O Jambyl region
   O Karaganda region
   O Kostanay region
   O Kyzylorda region
   O Mangystau region
   O North Kazakhstan region
   O Pavlodar region
   O Turkistan region
   O West Kazakhstan region
5. What is your place of birth? Which city or village? .................................
6. In which city do you study?  O Astana  O Almaty
7. Your university: .................................................................
8. Degree you’re studying for:
   O Bachelor  O Master  O PhD  O Other (specify): ......................
9. Your major: ............................................................

10. What is your MOTHER’S native language(s)? If there is more than one, please list all. ............................................................

11. What is your FATHER’S native language(s)? If there is more than one, please list all. ............................................................

12. What is your native language(s) (language(s) you speak from birth)? If there is more than one, please list all.

..........................................................................................

13. What is your language of instruction at the university?

O Russian    O Kazakh    O Other (specify): ...............  

LINGUISTIC PROFICIENCY

14. Read the statements below and tick ALL that applies to your knowledge of Kazakh, Russian and English.

1) I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I’m trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics. I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know.

2) I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself. I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job.

3) I can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. I can enter unprepared into conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events). I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes and ambitions. I can briefly give reasons and
explanations for opinions and plans. I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions.

4) I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining my views. I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.

5) I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. I can use language flexibly and effectively for social and professional purposes. I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate my contribution skilfully to those of other speakers. I can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.

6) I can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion and have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. I can express myself fluently and convey finer shades of meaning precisely. If I do have a problem I can backtrack and restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it. I can present a clear, smoothly-flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points.

THE FIRST ASSOCIATIONS

15. Write here a couple of associations with the English language that immediately come to your mind: ........................................................................................................................................

16. Write here a couple of associations with the Russian language that immediately come to your mind: ........................................................................................................................................

17. Write here a couple of associations with the Kazakh language that immediately come to your mind: ........................................................................................................................................
WHAT DO YOU THINK OF LANGUAGE POLICY OF KAZAKHSTAN?

18. How often do you use the Latin script while writing and texting in Kazakh?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Several times a day</th>
<th>Once a day</th>
<th>Several days per week</th>
<th>Once per week</th>
<th>Once per month</th>
<th>Very rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While writing</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While texting</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. If you don’t use the Latin script, why? .................................................................

20. What do you think about the recent script reform of Kazakh script? Multiple answers are possible.

a. The reform will speed up the process of integration of our country into the global community.

b. It is a waste of money and time.

c. The reform is a positive change since all new technologies are based on the Latin script.

d. I support it because the Latin script is the feature of developed countries.

e. It may cause deterioration of interethnic relations within Kazakhstan.

f. The reform will facilitate the study of the Kazakh language by foreigners.

g. It may cause a split in the Kazakhstani society as it will create a barrier between generations.

h. It will help the Kazakh language enter the global information space.

i. The reform will cause economic slowdown since it may signal alienating Russia and other post-Soviet countries.

j. The reform will cause even greater slowdown in the process of introducing the Kazakh language as the state language.

k. It is connected with distancing from the Soviet past and rather associated with Kazakhstan being an independent country.

l. Kazakh language will become even more difficult to learn.

m. The Latin script is better in terms of the transmission of the sound system of Turkic languages, including Kazakh.
n. The reform may cause increased outflow of Russian speaking population from Kazakhstan.

21. Do you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>rather agree</th>
<th>neither agree</th>
<th>rather disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The official renaming practices of geographical objects</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for example, streets, airports, cities)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are transparent and justified in Kazakhstan</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Principle of taking into account</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public opinion regarding the official renaming practices of geographical objects in Kazakhstan is often violated.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mass media is widely involved into the process of the official</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renaming practices of geographical objects.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Generally, I’m satisfied with work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the commissions responsible for the official renaming of geographical objects.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I approve most of the new names given to geographical objects.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. When you asked for service in state institutions or national companies in Kazakh, was it always possible to get one in this language?

- Always
- Occasionally
- Rarely
- Never
- I didn’t ask for services in Kazakh

23. Do you use electronic government portal (egov.kz) in Kazakh?

- Often
- Sometimes
24. On a scale from 1 to 7 indicate whether you are satisfied with the quality of their service in Kazakh. 1 is completely dissatisfied and 7 is very satisfied. ....................
25. If you have any comments on the quality of electronic government portal’s service in Kazakh, write them here.
...............................................................................................................................
26. On a scale from 1 to 7 (1 is completely dissatisfied and 7 is very satisfied), to what extent are you satisfied with:
a. QUALITY of Kazakh language content in media and social networks
b. TOPICALITY of the Kazakh language content in media and social networks
c. ORIGINALITY of Kazakh language content in media and social networks
d. QUANTITY of translations and publishing of the world literature, encyclopedias, business and scientific literature into the Kazakh language
e. QUALITY of translations and publishing of the world literature, encyclopedias, business and scientific literature into the Kazakh language
27. If you have any additional comments on Kazakh language content in media and social networks and translations and publishing of the world literature, encyclopedias, business and scientific literature into Kazakh language, write it here.
...............................................................................................................................
28. Personally for you, has the use of the Kazakh language ever evoked any negative associations?
O Yes, quite often for me the use of the Kazakh language evokes negative associations
O Only sometimes the use of the Kazakh language is associated with something negative
O The use of the Kazakh language is never associated with something negative for me
29. What kind of negative associations does use of the Kazakh language provoke in your mind? ........................................................................................................................................................................
30. In which cultural events held in English do you participate?
O Foreign Cultures Day
O Exhibitions
O Movies screening
O Other (please specify): ...........................................................................

O I don’t participate in that kind of events

31. Are you satisfied with the quality and quantity of such events? Why yes? Why not?
........................................................................................................................................

If your language of instruction at the university is Russian, press the button “Further”.

32. If your language of instruction at the university is Kazakh, write the first 3 terms connected to your major in Kazakh that come to your mind.
........................................................................................................................................

33. What do you think, in your major, what is the ratio between terms properly translated into Kazakh and international terms? Write in percentage (for example, 50% of Kazakh ones and 50% of international ones).
........................................................................................................................................

TEACHING AND LEARNING OF KAZAKH, RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

34. What are (or were) your reasons and motivation for learning Kazakh, Russian and English in schools and at universities? Why have you been learning these languages? Multiple answers are possible for one language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For professional reasons</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because this language is important</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use the language during vacation / on a trip</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the interest towards the language</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To know the language spoken in my country better</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For educational reasons</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use the language with friends</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only because it was obligatory at school / at the university</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. If there is some other reason(s), please write it here:
....................................................................................................

36. Have you experienced the trilingual model of education yourself? Have you had any subjects taught in language that differs from your language of instruction (for example, computer science in English)?
   O Yes, and I liked this experience
   O Yes but I didn’t like this experience
   O No but I would like to try
   O No, and I wouldn’t like to try

37. If you experienced the trilingual model of education yourself and you didn’t like it, why? ........................................................................................................................................................................................................

38. Do you agree with the following statements?

   a. Trilingual model of education is very confusing
      because in the end you don’t master neither subjects taught in different languages nor the languages themselves.
      O O O O O

   b. I support trilingualism in education because it’s a good possibility to learn Kazakh, Russian and/ or English better.
      O O O O O

   c. Trilingualism is the key of our country’s development.
      O O O O O

   d. Without trilingualism policy Kazakhstani citizens would probably know Kazakh and Russian better.
      O O O O O

   e. Personally for me, it would be useful to master Kazakh, O O O O O
Russian and English (all three).

f. The government should decrease putting the emphasis on trilingualism promotion.

39. On a scale from 1 to 7 indicate whether you were satisfied with the quality of your Kazakh, Russian and English language classes (teaching itself) IN SCHOOL. 1 is completely dissatisfied, 7 is very satisfied. ........................

40. On a scale from 1 to 7 indicate whether you were satisfied with the quality of your Kazakh, Russian and English language classes (teaching itself) AT THE UNIVERSITY. 1 is completely dissatisfied, 7 is very satisfied. ........................

41. If you are NOT satisfied with the following features of your Kazakh, Russian and English language classes in schools or at universities, please indicate it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Qualification of language teachers</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Modernisation of classes</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Creativity of classes</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Textbooks</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. If you are not satisfied with something else regarding Kazakh, Russian and English classes, please write it here.

...........................................................................................................................................................................

WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THESE LANGUAGES?

43. Do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>rather agree</th>
<th>neither agree</th>
<th>rather disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I feel that the Kazakh language strengthens unity of all nationalities living in Kazakhstan</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The use of Russian suppresses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the spread of Kazakh in many spheres of life

c. The Kazakh language has been weakening the spread of Russian language lately

d. To know the Kazakh language is obligatory for every citizen of the country

e. Studying Kazakh is not useful since it’s spoken only in Kazakhstan.

f. It’s good that demand for knowing Kazakh at workplaces has increased for the last 5 years.

g. The majority of successful people in Kazakhstan speak Kazakh.

h. People who master English or Russian are perceived as more prestigious than those who know Kazakh.

i. It’s good that in media for the last 5 years the quantity of youth content in Kazakh language has increased.

j. It’s important for Kazakh to replace Russian as the language of interethnic communication in future.

k. Almost no one in Kazakhstan uses English, so it’s better to exclude it from the obligatory curriculum.

44. To what extent the following advantages of the ENGLISH language are important personally for you?

a. With English I can make myself better understood abroad

very important    rather important    rather unimportant    not important at all

O                           O                           O                           O   O
b. With English I can understand music lyrics, English TV series, videos, movies and/ or books better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. With English I have a better chance to get a good job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. A lot of things sound better in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. English gives me access to new developments in science and technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. I need English for further education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. To what extent the following advantages of the KAZAKH language are important personally for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. With Kazakh I can make myself better understood abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. With Kazakh I can understand music lyrics, Kazakh TV series, videos, movies and/ or books better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. With Kazakh it is easier to have contact with the majority of my country’s population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. A lot of things sound better in Kazakh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Kazakh gives me access to new developments in science and technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. I need Kazakh for further education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. With Kazakh I have a better chance to get a good job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>rather unimportant</th>
<th>not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. To what extent the following advantages of the RUSSIAN language are important personally for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Rather Important</th>
<th>Rather Unimportant</th>
<th>Not Important at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. With Russian I can make myself better understood abroad</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. With Russian I can understand music lyrics, Russian TV series, videos, movies and/or books better</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. With Russian it is easier to have contact with the majority of my country’s population</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A lot of things sound better in Russian</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Russian gives me access to new developments in science and technology</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I need Russian for further education</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. With Russian I have a better chance to get a good job</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KAZAKH, RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH IN YOUR LIFE**

47. How often do you use RUSSIAN in the following situations? Tick the option that best matches your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Very Often (on everyday basis)</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With parents</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With siblings</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With grandparents</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With neighbours</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When traveling abroad</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In medical institutions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 48. How often do you use KAZAKH in the following situations? Tick the option that best matches your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>very often (on everyday basis)</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>very rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With parents</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With siblings</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With grandparents</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With neighbours</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When traveling abroad</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In medical institutions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In administrative institutions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the service sector</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 49. How often do you use ENGLISH in the following situations? Tick the option that best matches your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>very often (on everyday basis)</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>very rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With parents</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With siblings</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With grandparents</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With neighbours</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When traveling abroad</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In medical institutions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In administrative institutions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the service sector</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50. How often do you use...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>several times a day</th>
<th>once a day</th>
<th>several days per week</th>
<th>once per week</th>
<th>once per month</th>
<th>very rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. listen to the radio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. watch movies/ videos/ TV series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. play videogames</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. use the Internet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. read newspapers, magazines, information portals (including the ones available online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. use social networks (Facebook, Vkontakte, Instagram, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. go to the theatre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. read books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. listen to the music</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. How often do you use RUSSIAN in your free time? Tick the option that best matches your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very often</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>very rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(on everyday basis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When attending theatrical performances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When watching movies/ videos/ TV series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When using social networks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When surfing Internet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When listening to the radio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When listening to the music</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When reading newspapers, magazines and information portals (including the ones available online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When reading books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When playing computer games</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. How often do you use KAZAKH in your free time? Tick the option that best matches your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When attending theatrical performances</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When watching movies/ videos/ TV series</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When using social networks</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When surfing Internet</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When listening to the radio</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When listening to the music</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When reading newspapers, magazines and information portals</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When reading books</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When playing computer games</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. How often do you use ENGLISH in your free time? Tick the option that best matches your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When attending theatrical performances</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When watching movies/ videos/ TV series</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When using social networks</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When surfing Internet</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When listening to the radio</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When listening to the music</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When reading newspapers, magazines and information portals</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including the ones available online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When reading books</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When playing computer games</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
54. Do you want your children to know Kazakh language?
   O Yes
   O Rather yes than no
   O Rather no than yes
   O No

55. Which language(s) will you use with your future children?

56. Generally, how often do you use the Kazakh, Russian and English languages (while speaking, writing, listening and reading)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>every day</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several times a week</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a week</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>couple of times a month</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very rarely</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. Which of the following skills do you use the most often, when you use Kazakh, Russian and English languages? Multiple answers are possible for one language.

   Speaking: O while using Kazakh; O while using Russian; O while using English
   Writing:  O while using Kazakh; O while using Russian; O while using English
   Reading:  O while using Kazakh; O while using Russian; O while using English
   Listening: O while using Kazakh; O while using Russian; O while using English

58. How often do the following situations happen to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>every day</th>
<th>several times a week</th>
<th>once a week</th>
<th>couple of times a month</th>
<th>once a month</th>
<th>very rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. When I speak Kazakh, I may suddenly switch to speaking fully in Russian and back.
   O O O O O O O
b. When I speak Kazakh, I may suddenly switch to speaking fully in English and back.
   O O O O O O O
c. When I speak Russian, I may suddenly switch to speaking fully in English and back.
d. When I speak Russian, I may suddenly switch to speaking fully in Kazakh and back.

59. How often do the following situations happen to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Every Day</th>
<th>Several Times</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Couple of Times</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. When I speak Kazakh, I include in my speech some words, phrases or whole sentences in Russian.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. When I speak Kazakh, I include in my speech some words, phrases or whole sentences in English.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. When I speak Russian, I include in my speech some words, phrases or whole sentences in Kazakh.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. When I speak Russian, I include in my speech some words, phrases or whole sentences in English.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. Have you heard of or took part in a similar research survey regarding language policy in Kazakhstan?
   O I’ve participated in a similar research surveys several times.
   O I’ve participated in a similar research survey once.
   O I’ve heard about similar research surveys in Kazakhstan but didn’t participate.
   O I’ve never heard about similar research surveys in Kazakhstan and never participated.

Thank you for your response!
Appendix 2: Respondents’ language proficiency in Kazakh, Russian and English among the ethnic Kazakhs, the ethnic Russians and the representatives of other ethnicities

Figure 3. Language proficiency among ethnic Kazakhs (in %)

Figure 4. Language proficiency among ethnic Russians (in %)
Figure 5. Language proficiency among respondents from other ethnic groups (in %)
Appendix 3: Frequency of deploying receptive and productive Kazakh, Russian and English language skills by respondents

Figure 6. Frequency of deploying various language skills, while using Kazakh, Russian and English (in %)
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